UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,313	04/08/2008	Jean-Noel Claveau	124545-00102	3807

27557 7590 06/16/2009

BLANK ROME LLP
WATERGATE
600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
AHMED, SHAMIM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,313	CLAVEAU, JEAN-NOEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shamim Ahmed	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/25/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Hix with the combination of Remer fails to teach the step of applying heat by dipping the article to decorated and the transfer sheet into a bath of non-ferrous alloy as Remer suggest only the article to be decorated into the non-ferrous alloy bath

In response to the argument, examiner states that the argument is not persuasive because Remer is introduce to modify Hix's heating (a radiant heat source (col.6, lines 41-61) with the heating/drying step of the decorated article by dipping it to a bath containing non-ferrous alloy, wherein the decorated article comprises a rigid panel surface to be decorated and the printed transfer sheet containing the subliming agent until the transfer is complete by the application of heat.

So, one of ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to modify Hix's heating with the teaching of Remer for easily transferring the subliming agent as Remer's heating or drying step is similar as the instant invention and expected to have the similar result such as activate the subliming substance or agent. Remer also suggests that such treatment followed by the coating improves the release characteristics of the solvent and/or the bonding or polymerization of the ink or coating deposit (col.1, lines 52-60).

Applicant argues that Remer teaches transferring a coating to an article by either applying the coating with an aerosol spray nozzle or running the article between two

rollers and such teaching is different than that in the instant invention as Remer teaches the coating is transferred to web prior to the web being dipped in the metal bath.

In response to the argument, examiner states that the argument is not persuasive because the primary reference Hix et al already teach that the coating the coating material onto a transfer sheet with a heat heat-activated substance and transferring the heat-activated substance to an article (such as textile fabric) by heat (see the rejection) and Remer is introduced to modify Hix et al's heating with the heating the coated article by dipping into the metal bath including non-ferrous metal alloy (see the rejection).

In response to applicant's argument that heating step in the instant invention has different purpose from that of Hix and Remer, the fact that applicant uses heating by dipping into a bath for a different purpose (see, page 9 of the remarks section) does not alter the conclusion that its use in a prior art device would be prima facie obvious from the purpose disclosed in the reference as drying is performed by heating the bath containing non-ferrous alloy (see the rejection). See, also In re Lintner, 173 USPQ 560.

Therefore, the previous rejection is repeated herein as below.

As to the provisional double patenting rejection, applicants fail to response, the rejections are repeated herein as below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,3-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hix et al (4,354,851) in view of Remer (3,565,039) as supported with Echtler (USP 4,283,954).

Hix disclose a process and apparatus for manufacturing a decorating article including the steps of heat transfer printing wherein a decoration or design is printed on a paper transfer sheet with a subliming dye or ink, and there after, the paper is pressed against the textile fabric and heated for a brief period of time and transferred to the textile fabric (article to be decorated) (col.1, lines 35-43 and also see col.2, lines 45-col.3, lines 1-8).

Hix et al teach that the printed transfer sheet contain sublimable coloring agent and the surface coating comprises polymeric coating such as water resistant, clear polymeric coating selected from acrylic polymers, polyester resins, etc. (col.3, lines 9-26).

Unlike the instant invention, Hix et al remain silent the introduction or applying heat by dipping the article to be decorated and the transfer sheet into a bath of non-ferrous metal alloy.

However, Remer teaches an apparatus for coating web or object such as paper, plastics, wires, fibers non-woven fabrics etc. with a suitable ink (col.1, lines 3-18).

Remer also teaches heating is performed to evaporate the solvent by conventional heater element (col.10, lines 33-42) and further teaches hot metal dip drying technique with the advantage of not only drying the webs to effect solvent removal, but also removing any electrical charges from the webs (col.10, lines 43-47) and typically the hot metal bath includes bismuth, tin, wood's alloy and lead as well as other metals having melting points ranging from 80 to 2000 degree F (col.10, lines 48-61), wherein the wood's alloy contain bismuth, lead, tin and cadmium with the claimed percent of the specific metals as supported by Echtler (see col.3, lines 8-10 in USP 4,283,954).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of claimed invention to employ Remer's teaching into Hix et al's teaching with the benefit suggested by Remer.

As to claim 15, Hix et al also teach that in addition to the water-resistant coating, the panel may also have one or more substrate coating, which may comprises pigments (col.3, lines 27-33).

As to claim 5, Hix et al's polymeric substrate broadly reads on the claimed Teflon based decorative article.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hix et al in view of Remer (3,565,039) as supported with Echtler as applied to claims 1,3-16 above, and further in view of Briss et al (2002/0104761).

Modified Hix et al discusses above except the alloy including antimony, tin, bismuth and lead.

However, Briss et al teach both the antimony and cadmium are functionally equivalent (see paragraph 0038).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of claimed invention to modify Remer's alloy by replacing cadmium with antimony as both the antimony and cadmium are functionally equivalent as suggested by Briss et al.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-4,9,13,16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13,17-20 of copending Application No. 11/792,978. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention in the application Serial No. '978 encompass the instant invention because the heat–activated substance of the instant invention is same as the subliming substance in the co-pending application '978.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/562,332 (US 2008/0011405). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention in the application Serial No. '332 encompass the instant invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shamim Ahmed whose telephone number is (571) 272-1457. The examiner can normally be reached on Tu-Fri (6:00-2:30) Every Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine G. Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shamim Ahmed
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

SA
June 15, 2009

/Shamim Ahmed/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792